

Message

---

**From:** Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) [David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil]  
**Sent:** 3/2/2020 8:00:15 PM  
**To:** Rankins, Jonathan E CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) [Jonathan.E.Rankins@usace.army.mil]; Clements, Julie A CIV (USA) [Julie.A.Clements@usace.army.mil]; Praskins, Wayne [Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov]; Walker, Stuart [Walker.Stuart@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** adult worker comparison  
**Attachments:** AW hunters point eval.xlsx

Adult Worker zero removable fraction scenarios compared. Decent agreement (less than an order of magnitude difference for all but Sr/Y-90) but BPRG and BDCC tend to be higher. Receptor location of average increases results for some isotopes and decreases for others in BPRG and BDCC (center of room used). RESRAD -BLD Reduction to 5 sources is still being done but minimal differences so far.

-----Original Message-----

From: Rankins, Jonathan E CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA)  
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 1:00 PM  
To: Clements, Julie A CIV (USA) <Julie.A.Clements@usace.army.mil>; Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil>; Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>; Walker, Stuart <Walker.Stuart@epa.gov>  
Subject: Pathway breakdown: 1% RF

Attached are the pathway-specific risk and dose calculations for the residential scenario based on separate 1-dimensional RESRAD-BUILD evaluations of floor and walls, with each ROC being a source. The results show that the external radiation pathway drives more than 90% of the total risk and dose. Please note that the evaluated pathways and results were taken directly from the model outputs. The model outputs show immersion as an evaluated pathway.